

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated September 29, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5-8 and 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Malik in view of Jain. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "the calling the assigned telephone number accessing a service switching point, the service switching point encountering a specific digit string trigger in response to the calling, the service switching point sending a call-related query to a service control point in response to the specific digit string trigger; the service control point prompting generation of a calling plan service announcement." Neither Malik nor Jain teach or suggest this feature. Malik uses an architecture in which a feature code such as *77 is used to initiate billing service. Malik does not teach the interaction between the service switching point and service control point recited in claim 1. Jain was relied upon for disclosing billing calls to multiple accounts. Jain fails to disclose the interaction between the service switching point and service control point as recited in claim 1. Thus, even if Malik and Jain are combined, the features of claim 1 do not result.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Malik in view of Jain. Claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Malik in view of Jain for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1. Claims 5-8 and 10 recite features similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1. Thus, claims 5-8 and 10 are patentable over Malik in view of Jain for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1.

Claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, "receiving a call-related query from a service switching point, the service switching point generating the call-related query in response to a specific digit string trigger." Neither Malik nor Jain teach or suggest this feature. Malik uses an architecture in which a feature code such as *77 is used to initiate billing service. Malik does

not teach the interaction between the service switching point and service control point recited in claim 11. Jain was relied upon for disclosing billing calls to multiple accounts. Jain fails to disclose the interaction between the service switching point and service control point as recited in claim 11. Thus, even if Malik and Jain are combined, the features of claim 11 do not result.

For at least the above reasons, claim 11 is patentable over Malik in view of Jain. Claims 12 and 13 variously depend from claim 11 and are patentable over Malik in view of Jain for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 11.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Malik in view of Jain and Kruger. Kruger was relied upon for disclosing an indicator designating an international call or not, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Malik in view of Jain discussed above with reference to claim 11. Thus, claim 15 is patentable over Malik in view of Jain and Kruger for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 11.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 36192

Date: December 29, 2005

090102
BLI-0091